

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated March 12, 2008.

Claims 1, 3, 4-12, 14-23, and 25-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen (2001/0030663) and Oosterholt (2001/0008399), and further in view of Kinnunen (2001/0021649). Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “[a] communication terminal accessible to a communication network, said communication terminal including: ... a display control unit controlling said display unit; and a control unit configured to control at least said display control unit to display on said display unit, in a stand-by mode of said communication terminal, at least one of: a first display mark which provides a reference information linked to past-referred to data stored in said communication terminal; ... a third display mark which provides an access-related information allowing said communication terminal to access a past-referred to file stored in a computer device connected to said communication network, and said access-related information being linked to said file, said access-related information including a URL address of said past-referred to file; ... said reference information having been automatically stored by said control unit in a normal operation mode of said communication terminal when said past-referred to data was referred to, said past-referred to file having been referred to in a communication mode of said communication terminal, and said URL address of said past-referred to file having been automatically stored by said control unit in said communication mode of said communication terminal when said past-referred to file was referred to.”

Independent claims 12 and 23 have been amended to provide, in part, for, “displaying on a display unit of said communication terminal, in a stand-by mode of said communication terminal, at least one of: a first display mark which provides a reference information linked to past-referred to data stored in said communication terminal; a second display mark... a third display mark which provides an access-related information allowing said communication terminal to access a past-referred to file stored in a computer device connected to said communication network, and said access-related information being linked to said file, said access-related information including a URL address of said past-referred to file; and a fourth display mark... a control unit being

configured to control at least a display control unit, said control unit controlling said display control unit to display on said display unit, in said stand-by mode of said communication terminal, at least one of said first display mark, said second display mark, said third display mark, and said fourth display mark, said reference information having been automatically stored by said control unit in a normal operation mode of said communication terminal when said past-referred to data was referred to, said past-referred to file having been referred to in a communication mode of said communication terminal, and said URL address of said past-referred to file having been automatically stored by said control unit in said communication mode of said communication terminal when said past-referred to file was referred to.”

Antecedent basis for the amendments to independent claims 1, 12, and 23 is found in the specification, for example, on page 11, lines 19-22, page 12, line 24, to page 13, line 4, page 17, line 12, to page 18, line 4, page 19, line 23, to page 20, line 17, page 21, lines 2-16, page 23, lines 15-21 and page 26, line 22, to page 27, line 6.

Amendments to dependent claims 5, 6 and 8 have been amended in conformity with claim 1 from which they depend and, in addition, have support in the specification, for example on page 18, line 5, to page 19, line 5, for claim 5, on page 24, lines 15-22, for claim 6, and on page 27, line 24, to page 28, line 6, for claim 8.

Amendments to dependent claims 9-11 have been made to conform to independent claim 1 from which they are dependent.

The Examiner contends that, with regard to independent claims 1, 12, and 23, Nielsen et al. discloses a processor 18 which he contends is equivalent to the control unit configured to control the display unit, (Office Action, page 4, paragraph 4, lines 12-13; page 8, line 18). However, the Examiner admits, with regard to independent claims 1, 12, and 23, that, “[t]he combination of Nielsen and Oosterholt fails to explicitly teach said access-related information includes a URL address of said past-referred to file, and said URL address of said past-referred to file having been automatically stored in said communication mode of said communication terminal when said past-referred to file was referred to,” (Office Action, page 7, lines 7-12; page 11, lines 5-9). The Examiner indicates that Kinnunen et al. “teaches a user interface for a radiotelephone in which a user is able to select components from a variety of sources including multimedia sources and the

Internet, wherein an access-related information includes a URL address of a past-referred to file, and said URL address of said past-referred to file having been automatically stored in said communication mode of said communication terminal when said past-referred to file was referred to (see p. 2 [0017]),” (Office Action, page 7, lines 12-17; page 11, lines 10-15).

However, Kinnunen et al. does not teach, disclose, or suggest a URL address of a past-referred to file having been automatically stored by a control unit in a communication mode of a communication terminal when said past-referred to file was referred to, and a reference information having been automatically stored by the control unit in a normal operation mode of the communication terminal when past referred-to data was referred to, the control unit controlling a display control unit to display on a display unit, in a stand-by mode of the communication terminal, at least one of a first display mark, a second display, a third display mark, and a fourth display mark, as required in independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

Since each of claims 3-11, 14-22, and 25-33 is directly dependent upon one of independent claims 1, 12, and 23, each of claims 3-11, 14-22, and 25-33 is allowable for at least the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of the appropriate one of independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 is respectfully requested. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON MAY 30, 2008



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700